

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 60) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. Mr. President, I ask that the previously scheduled rollcall vote start immediately.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

VOTE ON GARCIA NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Garcia nomination?

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) is necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 53, nays 46, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 15 Ex.]

YEAS—53

Baldwin	Heinrich	Reed
Bennet	Hickenlooper	Rosen
Blumenthal	Hirono	Sanders
Booker	Kaine	Schatz
Brown	Kelly	Schumer
Cantwell	King	Shaheen
Cardin	Klobuchar	Sinema
Carper	Lujan	Smith
Collins	Manchin	Stabenow
Coons	Markey	Tester
Cortez Masto	Menendez	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Merkley	Warner
Durbin	Murkowski	Warnock
Feinstein	Murphy	Warren
Fetterman	Murray	Welch
Gillibrand	Ossoff	Whitehouse
Graham	Padilla	Wyden
Hassan	Peters	

NAYS—46

Barrasso	Grassley	Risch
Blackburn	Hagerty	Romney
Boozman	Hawley	Rounds
Braun	Hoeben	Rubio
Britt	Hyde-Smith	Schmitt
Budd	Johnson	Scott (FL)
Capito	Kennedy	Scott (SC)
Cassidy	Lankford	Sullivan
Cornyn	Lee	Thune
Cotton	Lummis	Tillis
Cramer	Marshall	Tuberville
Crapo	McConnell	Vance
Cruz	Moran	Wicker
Daines	Mullin	Young
Ernst	Paul	
Fischer	Ricketts	

NOT VOTING—1

Casey

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MARKEY). Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table, and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 15, Adrienne C. Nelson, of Oregon, to be United States District Judge for the District of Oregon.

Richard J. Durbin, Sheldon Whitehouse, Martin Heinrich, Tim Kaine, Tammy Baldwin, Ben Ray Lujan, Tammy Duckworth, John W. Hickenlooper, Amy Klobuchar, Jack Reed, Jeanne Shaheen, Brian Schatz, Edward J. Markey, Benjamin L. Cardin, Alex Padilla, Margaret Wood Hassan, Catherine Cortez Masto.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Adrienne C. Nelson, of Oregon, to be United States District Judge for the District of Oregon, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) is necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE) and the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE) would have voted "nay" and the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS) would have voted "nay."

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 53, nays 44, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 16 Ex.]

YEAS—53

Baldwin	Graham	Murray
Bennet	Hassan	Ossoff
Blumenthal	Heinrich	Padilla
Booker	Hickenlooper	Peters
Brown	Hirono	Reed
Cantwell	Kaine	Rosen
Cardin	Kelly	Sanders
Carper	King	Schatz
Collins	Klobuchar	Schumer
Coons	Lujan	Shaheen
Cortez Masto	Manchin	Sinema
Duckworth	Markey	Smith
Durbin	Menendez	Stabenow
Feinstein	Merkley	Tester
Fetterman	Murkowski	Van Hollen
Gillibrand	Murphy	

Warner
Warnock

Warren
Welch

Whitehouse
Wyden

NAYS—44

Barrasso
Blackburn
Boozman
Braun
Britt
Budd
Capito
Cassidy
Cornyn
Cotton
Cramer
Crapo
Cruz
Daines
Ernst

Fischer
Grassley
Hagerty
Hawley
Hoeben
Hyde-Smith
Johnson
Kennedy
Lankford
Lummis
Marshall
McConnell
Moran
Mullin
Paul

Ricketts
Risch
Romney
Rounds
Rubio
Schmitt
Scott (FL)
Scott (SC)
Sullivan
Thune
Tuberville
Vance
Wicker
Young

NOT VOTING—3

Casey

Lee

Tillis

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WARNOCK). On this vote, the yeas are 53, the nays are 44.

The motion is agreed to.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The bill clerk read the nomination of Adrienne C. Nelson, of Oregon, to be United States District Judge for the District of Oregon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

U.S. SUPREME COURT

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I am back today now for the 20th time to shed a little light on the dark money scheme to capture and control our Supreme Court.

Part of what allows that scheme to flourish is the ethics-free zone around the Supreme Court. It is quite unique. So let's look at it.

The last time I gave this speech, No. 19, I walked through the various problems with how the Supreme Court handles allegations of misconduct by the Justices.

The short answer is that it doesn't.

The U.S. Supreme Court is the only court in the country not covered by an ethics code. And worse than that, it is the only part of the Federal Government that has no process for ethics investigation and enforcement—none.

Now, any meaningful ethics regime contains three things: first, a process for receiving complaints; second, a process for investigating those complaints once they are received; and, third, a process for reporting the result and holding powerful people accountable should those complaints turn out to be merited.

The House and the Senate, for instance, we have our Ethics Committees. The executive branch has inspector generals and the attorney general. The Federal courts, except the Supreme Court, have their own investigative procedures. It is just the Supreme Court that has none. The closest you get is probably a motion to recuse.

Let's start with the difficulty of raising ethics complaints with the Supreme Court. People who are concerned about ethics violations over at the Court have to get pretty creative because the Court has no place to submit